

**Karner Blue HCP  
HCP Monitoring Improvement Team (MIT)  
November 10, 2004  
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
UWSP Schmeekle Reserve, Stevens Point**

**MINUTES**

- 1. Anti-trust statement** – Read by Dave
- 2. Review Agenda & Monitoring Improvement Process Steps** (March 5, 2004 revision attached. Is this still applicable?) **(15 min.)**

**Present**

Paul Rasmussen, WDNR  
Dave Lentz, WDNR  
Jaime Thibodeaux, WDNR  
Matt Krumenauer, ATC  
Bob Hess, WDNR  
Scott Swengel  
Tim Wilder, DOD Fort McCoy  
Cathy Carnes, USFWS  
Joel Aanensen, Plum Creek Timber

**Discussions of Lessons Learned from NCTC Monitoring Training**

*Dave- Things learned from NCTC are that we must look more closely at implementation monitoring, protocol monitoring, and cause and effect monitoring. It's important to look at cause and effect monitoring so that we may learn what actions are effective and what actions are not. If we are going to study monitoring, we must also define our objectives especially with regard to suitable habitat. What is suitable habitat? Pre-management and post-management monitoring may be the key to finding what actions are effective.*

*Cathy- Additionally, we must remember that adaptive resource management is a process. First you need to plan, which is where we are now. Then we will act, and actually monitor it. We need to do statically sound monitoring. Then we need to meet again and plan. Once our plan is in action, we still need to talk. It is also important to have species biologists on our team to make sure our product is sound, e.g. Have Cynthia Lane review our monitoring product.*

*Dave-initially to prove our protocols we need to research our management and monitoring more rigorously than initially thought.*

**IMPROVEMENT THROUGH RESEARCH**

*There is a question of who would pay for the research with monitoring. Dave suggests that if additional monitoring is needed, because most of the management activities that require additional proof are forestry activities, the workload and cost will likely fall on the Forestry Partners. They may simply have their monitoring effort re-directed to answer some of our pending questions. Additionally, once the data*

*manager position becomes filled, the data that already has been gathered through previous self-monitoring can be entered and analyzed.*

*Much of the needed data comes into our annual reports for monitoring, but some of the components for habitat are not in our monitoring. Research will always need to be tied into management objectives and be statistically sound. We must meet monitoring objectives with our research as well. Some of this research and data may need to be buffered with additional data sets from other sources.*

## **NO NET LOSS OF HABITAT**

*Cathy stresses that one of our major goals is to have no net loss of habitat. We need to apply our adaptive management and goal of “no net loss” and yet maintain the shifting mosaic. We should first define what we have for habitat so that no net loss of habitat is allowed.*

*Dave, however, suggested we need to identify areas with Karners and focus on occupied habitat and SM function where KBB occur and where management will take place. We should not be so concerned with no net loss of habitat. For example, Bauer Brockway is a core area that is probably feeding other areas. Instead of fighting a losing battle in some areas, add management on lands with Karners already found there or nearby.*

*Quincy Bluff is a good example of where our management is not working for Karners. We need to look at areas where there is a SM and understand the SM. It is very difficult to look at no net loss of habitat in the state of WI due to the magnitude of populations and the scale.*

## **POSSIBLE RESEARCH AND MONITORING QUESTIONS**

*There are a number of questions we have that may be answered after analyzing our pre and post management monitoring. However, we need to decide on what our “protocols” for suitable habitat should be. In many ways the presence of Karners is our final protocol.*

*Our data only gives us presence/absence for self-monitoring. Selected sites have relative abundance. One thing agreed upon was to research on areas where our management objectives don’t have certainty, and make assumptions where our management works. For example, canopy cover and number of nectaring plants are items that need more research.*

*Therefore, we should look at the data we already have then build on it with more data if needed to answer our questions. We can find examples of where our adaptive management isn’t working and look at our data to see why it’s not working. If need be, we can gather more data.*

*.....break.....*

*Summary thus far: (Dave)*

- 1. Take into account all the data we have collected.*
- 2. Look where we still have data gaps.*
- 3. Get more data if needed.*

*We have presence, absence, and then the parameter for lupine.*

*Without a data manager to work up all available data, we may not be in a position to start new cause and effect monitoring this spring. We should consider focusing on post and pre-management survey data already obtained. We should also do more post-management monitoring in areas where there wouldn’t be traditionally a post-*

management survey. Examples are short term steps between management activities where the post-management has been identified as the next pre-management survey for the next step. Also, where post-management surveys have not been done, these should be done in 2005 if meaningful.

We have many partners with lands close together where KBBs move back and forth. Putting all of these sites on maps will help us to put our management on a multi-partner scale and a KBB's perspective. We may possibly be able to obtain more specific locational data with the partners if we can protect this data through NHI. There is concern, however, that where data may be the beneficiary of USFWS funding that the data may possibly be open to public records even if recorded in the NHI system.

**Dave ACTION** –Ask for legal advice with Jimmy Christiansen about protecting partner data. Specifically about any association with Federal funds to acquire data if we are the holders of the data. Conference call with Cathy, Jimmy, Dave- answer all the questions.

With locational information mapped, we may have a stronger, simpler tool to help demonstrate that SM works. This kind of presentation can provide informed reference to where to concentrate our efforts for mitigation purposes.

#### **Meeting Summary of discussion:**

So far, we're going to:

1. Enter and analyze all existing data, then
2. Look where we have data gaps, then
3. If possible, plan to fill gaps in 2005
4. At a minimum, ask partners to look for opportunities to do post management in 2005, also
5. Improve the HCP "Lands" database, including moving toward GIS data
6. Look into assurance to protect location specific data through NHI.
7. After we know what existing data that has not previously been analyzed can tell us about the cause and effect of HCP management, we can better know what needs to be done next.

Timeline: the winter HCP meeting is Feb 16<sup>th</sup> in Eau Claire, we'll see what we have then. For the new DNR HCP data manager when in place:

1. orientation training asap .
2. Enter self-monitoring data into the database.
3. Provide information for analysis by MIT.

#### **Additional questions**

Do we want to keep doing the surveys for Karners, and find them? Should we focus on areas where Karners have already been found and can be managed for?

At some point in time, we will want to recognize that additional resources applied to find remaining KBB populations will have diminishing returns.

**Action Item MIT:** MIT should frame this question and pose it to the partners.

**Justification to the FWS will be needed.**

### **3. Review March 10 meeting results (minutes attached) and action items. (30 min.)**

Review issues for refresher and discuss for clarity and understanding.  
*What issues do we still need to iron out?*

## Actions from Last Meeting:

Action	Status
Assess existing self-monitoring data to determine if currently used ROW maintenance rotations are appropriate for maintaining KBB populations on POH sites.	This was not done. <i>Matt- We have some other data from ROW data and we can look at nectar abundance. Cathy and Scott- We should also look at a canopy state of mind rather than trying to assess the vegetation types. Doesn't have to be a tree, but just so high. We can look at utility companies; we can look at some sights if we needed to.</i>
Do literature search and look at previous EM data to see if patten emerges (Matt/Scott). Provide additional literature on impacts of ROW management on KBBs if available (Cathy)	<i>Matt- did some background work with NIPSGO. This action will carry over to next meeting.</i>
Paul, work on documenting degree of skips on representative burn units at Crex; Cathy talk to Rich King about a larval study.	<i>We asked Rich to take photos, and he did. We still need to learn about KBB survival following fire. However, this will take serious money. This would fall into the realm of recovery management. Discussion of burning- we gave burning a category of 1 for lupine, but a category 2 for skip and lupine survival.</i>
Example of exotic species landscape GIS habitat. Use this as an example.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jaime send the abstract from the North American Prairie conference.</li> </ul>
Revise the chart for "take minimized" and "no take".	<i>–carry this action over.</i>
Scott Bernstein was to set-up a site-pool to study the sites for the category 2 monitoring uncertainties.	<i>Many haven't submitted sites yet. Those who have are in database. Needs to be completed – 2 redefining or re-asking for site pools for Feb 16<sup>th</sup>.</i>
Develop monitoring protocols for the 10 activities to be studied.	<i>Dave has done through draft 4 of all the activities. We also have the draft at the 2 level. Dave will send this to the team again for Feb 16<sup>th</sup>.</i>
Consider having a	<i>Need to have people with exposure to the issue. i.e. Jon</i>

discussion of ATV remedies for HCP summer meeting. Maybe we could have it at the winter meeting on Feb 16 <sup>th</sup> .	<b>Schweitzer. Invite someone who belongs to an ATV club.</b> Discussion of having a trail system to encourage them to use these. But, they destroy the roads for the trail. Do county forests allow off trail ATV use??? Deal with this through enforcement and education.
---	--

**4. Based on 2/18 meeting, design or redesign a DRAFT "new monitoring protocol" and/or sampling strategies to accomplish the adaptive management strategies and monitoring objectives. (2.5 hours) –this was all done above and will be categorized out.**

- Review "Adaptive Management Studies" list (attached) for completeness, correctness and uncertainty category assignments
- Develop monitoring strategies for #2 Category of Uncertainty items.
- Develop sampling plans for #2 Category of Uncertainty items.
- Consider role of self-monitoring surveys in new effectiveness monitoring strategy.
- Consider if knowledge gaps (research needs) fit into monitoring strategy design for category 2 studies.

**5. Review site pool submissions and discuss issues. (30 min.)**

*Not many of the partners have had their site pool submission in. (see previous actions list).*

**6. Closing (15 min.)**

- Summarize action items & assignments.

**New Actions:**

Action	Who and how
What about heavy maintenance with Weaver Boos? Not covered as a routine activity. Need to get whoever is going to do that covered as an action item. Needs to be covered under the HCP.	<b>Amend the SHCA for activities, then identify mitigating and minimizing the take of Karners.</b> -Matt
Start getting locational data for monitoring from partners.	<b>Dave ACTION –Ask for legal advice with Jimmy Christenson about protecting partner data. Specifically about any association with Federal funds to acquire data if we are the holders of the data. Conference call with Cathy, Jimmy, Dave- answer all the questions.</b>
<b>Get the partners to do post-management surveys where feasible in 2005.</b>	<b>ACTION ITEM: Add this to 2005 monitoring directive. Instruct partners at 2/16/05 HCP meeting.</b>
Hire a data manager and begin to enter-in the data.	<b>ACTION Dave, Darrell Z. and new data manager.</b>

- Next steps, i.e. test out/design statistical rigor of sampling plan, etc.
- Schedule another MIT meeting

**Last week of January –Tuesday January 25<sup>th</sup> 2005. 9:30am. Steven's Point, location to be determined.**

\\MIT Minutes 11-10-04.doc